DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 874 SO 013 492

AUTHOR Natriello, Gary; Dornbusch, Sanford M.
TITLE The Stratification of Socialization Processes: A View from the Classroom.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (New York, NY, August, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Behavior Problems; Behavior Standards; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Socialization; Student Behavior; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Response; Teacher Role; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

In this study, teachers were asked to complete questionnaires designed to determine how they handle 16 typical classroom problems concerning students' failures to conform to the academic achievement or social behavior norms of the school. In one form of the questionnaire, 156 teachers from 14 schools were presented with hypothetical profiles of student's ethnicity, sex, academic achievement record, and social behavior record. After reading the classroom problems and student profiles, teachers explained how they would respond to the problems, either by presenting to students standards of behavior and/or warmth. "Presentation of standards" refers to expectations, evaluations, and judgments made about both academic performance and behavior. "Warmth" means "expressions of personal concern." In the second form of the questionnaire, 168 teachers in 18 schools were presented with typical classroom problems and asked to select students at random from their roll books and to associate each with one of the specific classroom problems. Teachers were asked how they would respond in terms of warmth and presentation of standards if these students failed to conform to a random selected school norm. It was hypothesized that teachers would be less warm and offer more standards to students with good behavior and high academic achievement and to students with poor behavior and high academic achievement teachers would respond with more warmth and less presentations of standards. The initial findings did not support the hypothesis. Among the findings are that teachers presented more standards to students with discrepant performance characteristics than to those with congruent performance characteristics. (AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207874

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

GARY NATRIELLO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Stratification of Socialization Processes: A View from the Classroom

Gary Natriello, Washington University
Sanford M. Dornbusch, Stanford University

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, August 1980.

SO 013 492

The Stratification of Socialization Processes: A View from the Classroom

Recent work on the effects of education has focused on two processes by which schools are supposed to affect students. Socialization theory has focused on the experiences provided by schools which attempt to enhance the competence of students in various areas, while allocation theory has called attention to the ways that schools select, sort, or allocate students to various adult roles in society (Meyer, 1977). Thus socialization theorists have concentrated on detailing the nature of the socialization experiences provided to all students (Dreeben, 1968), and allocation theorists have examined the bases for the allocative "decisions" made by schools (Cicourel and Kitsuse, 1963; Bowles and Gintis, 1976). Although these lines of research and the theories upon which they are based have from time to time been portrayed as mutually exclusive (Collins, 1971; Bowels and Gintis, 1976; Carnoy and Levin, 1975), Meyer (1977) has pointed out that it may be both more fruitful and more accurate to consider them as complementary rather than as contradictory, a perspective summed up quite nicely by Rosenbaum's (1975) phrase "the stratification of socialization processes." We attempt in this paper to apply to empirical data on teacher behavior in the classroom our view that these perspectives are complementary.

Research on school effects has searched without success for evidence of outcome differences between schools (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969; Jencks, 1972). Pointing to the fact that within-school differences in student achievement are always greater than between-school differences, researchers have turned to an examination of the differentiation of socialization processes within schools, more specifically, between curriculum tracks (Heyns, 1974; Rosenbaum, 1975; Alexander and McDill, 1976; Alexander, Cook and McDill, 1978).

Research at this level has revealed differences in the patterns of socilization experiences of students assigned to different classrooms within the same school.

Research on between-school differences and between-classroom differences has explicitly considered the structural aspects of each situation. For example, investigators of between-school differences have commented on the unequal distribution of educational resources (Coons, Clooney and Sugarman, 1970), and those dealing with between-classroom differences have mentioned, among other things, the characteristics of peer associates (Alexander and McDill, 1976) as possible causes of differences in outcomes. At the classroom level, however, considerations of within-classroom differences in socialization processes have not explicitly examined the structural aspects of the teaching-learning situation in schools. These investigations have focused on the teacher as an actor able to determine the situation. Thus we have studies of teacher bias or teacher expectations (Dusek, 1975) which focus on the behavior of individual teachers. The patterns of differences in socialization processes within classrooms are not placed within the context of the structural features of the classroom and the school.

Studies of within-classroom differences, we believe, should explicitly consider structural features. Studies of between-school and between-classroom differences have been enhanced by the use of structural analyses. The study of teacher effects may conceivably show similar impact of structural factors.

Design Considerations

We began, as have most studies of teacher behavior toward students, by considering the bases for such differences in the characteristics of students. Reviewing the literature on teacher expectations, we selected four student characteristics that would be likely to be related to differences in teacher behavior: ethnicity, sex, previous academic achievement, and previous record of classroom behavior. While other student characteristics might have been

included in our study (cf. Rist, 1970), limited resources constrained our design to these four independent variables.

Earlier studies of differences in teacher behavior toward students with different characteristics (i.e. studies of within-classroom differences) have tended not to control for the classroom behavior of students when assessing the impact of student characteristics on teacher behavior. As we have pointed out in greater detail elsewhere (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979), study designs which have failed to consider student behavior as a variable make it impossible to determine whether reported differences in teacher behavior are the result of differences in student characteristics, as has generally been assumed, or if these differences are really the result of differences in student behavior to which the teachers in turn react. More importantly, in light of our present concern with making studies of teacher effects useful for researchers of school effects, studies of teacher effects have failed to consider the structural aspects of the teaching-learning situation. For example, most studies of the effects of student characteristics on teacher behavior do not specify the task in which the teacher and student are engaged. When we begin to consider the effects of the structural aspects of the situation on teacher behavior, it becomes apparent that studies on teacher effects have by and large treated teaching tasks and, indeed, the entire context of teaching and learning, as homogeneous.

While we cannot consider all of the structural elements in teacher-student interaction in classrooms in public schools in the present study, we move a step in this direction by specifying the interaction situation. Thus we limit ourselves to considering situations where students present academic problems or social behavior problems to the teacher. We decided to concentrate on classroom "problems" in order to bring together the literatures on teacher effects and school effects. We felt that teacher responses to classroom

problems were crucial teacher-student interactions, crucial both in providing an arena for the expression of differences in teacher behavior and in determining, at least in part, the level of student performance. Classroom problems arise where the norms of the school and the behavior of the students come into conflict. Limiting our analysis to teacher responses to classroom problems allows us to begin to consider the structural features of the teaching-learning situation which influence differences in teacher behavior. Consequently, our specification of academic problems and behavior problems as variables to control is based on our belief that school organizations will handle these two types of student behavior differently and that teacher behavior will reveal different patterns in response to these two types of student behavior.

In the absence of a theory of teaching effectiveness (Rosenshine, 1976), the selection of teacher behavior variables becomes problematic. The teaching effectiveness literature has attempted without success to deal with this problem by considering an incredibly broad range of teacher behavior variables (Rosenshine and Furst, 1973). At the same time investigators of school effects have disregarded teacher behavior while searching for differences in student learning outcomes presumed to be related to differences in socialization processes (Rosenbaum, 1975). Some investigators of school effects have given detailed consideration to such factors as "peer influences" (Alexander and McDill, 1976), but none has brought differences in teacher behavior into the model.

In his review of the literature on the school as an organization, Bidwell (1965) points to several features of educational institutions which have implications for teaching effectiveness. He begins by noting that the student role is a recruitment role and that:

> Young persons are compelled to enter school systems as students simply because of their placement in certain age grades, without reference to specific performances. Furthermore, since students are to be socialized into adult life, the central activities of this role are not directly relevant to the immediate interests or lives of its incumbents. (Bidwell, 1965:973)

Bidwell goes on to discuss two dimensions of teacher behavior in dealing with students. First, he notes that in order to produce a uniform product, schools and teachers engage in the "universalistic and thus uniform assessment of student accomplishment." Thus teachers present institutional standards to students and evaluate their performance in terms of those standards.

However, presenting standards to students and demanding their compliance may not be enough to promote learning in view of the fact that students may not see schools as relevant to their immediate interests. Bidwell notes this while reviewing the contribution of Willard Waller to the study of schools:

> Motivation to learn, he said, is very largely a product of a close, warm relation between teacher and student. Compliance may produce little intrinsic learning and a good deal of internal resistance among students. (Bidwell, 1965:979)

Thus Bidwell suggests that teaching behavior consists of instances of universalistic assessment as well as instances of more diffuse responsiveness.* In the present study we have specified these dimensions of teaching behavior as

a) the extent to which teachers present school standards for performance,
b) the extent to which teachers are warm and friendly to students.

We assume that to promote student learning, teachers must engage in both of these behaviors (though this assumption may be modified by the context within which teaching occurs), an assumption which although never directly tested, receives some support from a range of studies in the social-psychology of teaching. While the selection of teacher standards and teacher warmth as

*Bidwell points out that these behaviors may be perceived as conflicting. Elsewhere we have discussed this issue (Natriello, 1979) and presented an analysis of data on the presentation of standards and of warmth by teachers (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980).

dependent variables is not without difficulties, it begins to address the problem of identifying facets of teacher behavior that have meaning in terms of the structural aspects of the teaching-learning situation.

Procedures

We asked teachers to complete questionnaires designed to determine how they handle typical classroom problems. In the questionnaire teachers were presented with typical classroom problems and asked to explain how they would respond to students' failures to conform to the academic achievement or social behavior norms of the school. Sixteen different classroom problems, eight involving failure to conform to academic achievement norms (e.g. You see that a student in your class is not handing in homework assignments.) and eight involving failure to conform to social behavior norms (e.g. You note that a student in your class is being belligerent and aggressive toward other students.) were developed in consultation with a group of classroom teachers. These problems were randomly ordered and their position on the questionnaires was systematically rotated.

In one form of the questionnaire, which we called the hypothetical student study, teachers were presented with a hypothetical profile of a student involved in each problem. The profile contained information on the student's ethnicity, sex, academic achievement record, and social behavior record. After reading the classroom problem and the student profile, teachers were asked to explain how they would respond to the problem. Teacher replies were scored according to the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and/or warmth.

In a second form of the questionnaire, which we called the roll book student study, teachers were again presented with typical classroom problems and asked how they would respond. This time the teachers were not provided with student profiles. Instead, they were asked to select students at random from their roll

books and to associate each with a specific classroom problem selected at random. Thus teachers were asked how they would respond if each student selected at random from their roll books failed to conform to a randomly selected school norm. At the end of the questionnaire teachers were asked to supply information on the status characteristics of each student. As with the first questionnaire, teacher responses were scored according to the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and/or warmth.

We developed two different studies that would provide comparable data and that would complement each other. The hypothetical student study provides us with systematic data on the effects of student characteristics. Since we are able to control the assignment of student characteristics, we are able to assess the independent effects of each characteristic. Of course, the disadvantage of this study is that it collects data on situations that might be quite removed from the actual classrooms of the teachers involved. The roll book student study, on the other hand, has the advantage of allowing us to get closer to the actual classroom behavior of teachers by asking them to react to students from their own classes. However, since we do not control the assignment of student characteristics in the roll book student study, we cannot easily assess the independent effects of each characteristic, or more importantly for our present analysis, the effects of selected pairs of characteristics. By using both techniques to study the effects of student characteristics on teacher behavior, we can have increased faith in those findings supported by both studies.

However, it is important to note here that while using questionnaires to collect data on teacher classroom behavior has many advantages, it also has the major disadvantage of not directly observing classroom behavior. Teachers will, no doubt, respond differently to the hypothetical problems presented in

the questionnaires than they would to actual problems presented in the classroom for two reasons. First, they have the time to reflect on their responses to the questionnaires. Second, they are presenting their ideas to an outside audience. This means that the responses to the questionnaires do not provide a substitute for classroom behavior, but rather ideas (and perhaps an ideology) linked to it.

In both studies teachers were asked to provide open-ended responses to the classroom problems. Their responses were coded in terms of the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and the extent to which they evidenced warmth. We adopted the following multiple value coding systems for each dimension:

Standards	Warmth
0 = No evidence of standards	0 = No Personal Concern
1 = Implicit Standards Used in the Teacher's Decision-Making	1 = Implicit Personal Concern Used in the Teacher's Decision-Making
2 = Implicit Standards Communicated to the Student	2 = Explicit Personal Concern Used in the Teacher's Decision Making
3 = Explicit Standards Used in the Teacher's Decision-Making	3 = Implicit Personal Concern Communicated to the Student
4 = Explicit Standards Communicated to the Student	4 = Explicit Personal Concern Communicated to the Student

Results

The hypothetical student study involved 156 teachers in 14 schools, each teacher responding to 16 classroom problems associated with hypothetical student profiles, a total of 2469 individual responses. The roll book student study involved 168 teachers in 18 schools responding to eight classroom problems which they associated with students from their own roll books, a total of 1344 responses. The data have been analyzed from a number of different perspectives. Earlier papers have discussed relative differences in teacher responses to student behavior and characteristics individually (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979), differences in teacher responses to behavior and academic

problems (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980a), and the relationship between teacher standards and teacher warmth (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980b).

In this paper we limit our analysis to what we have identified as the stratification of socialization processes in the classroom. Since our previous analyses revealed that student ethnicity and student sex played a relatively minor role in producing differences in teacher behavior compared to student academic achievement record and student social behavior record (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979), our analysis here is limited to the more powerful effects of the latter characteristics.

Initially we expected to find a straightforward relationship between each of these student characteristics and teacher standards and warmth. We expected that teachers would present more standards and less warmth to students with good behavior records and high achievement records and that these differences in teacher behavior could then be used to explain the increasingly greater differences in student achievement as students proceed through school. Thus we expected students with better achievement and social behavior records to receive socialization experiences that would challenge them to enhance their records in both dimensions, while in the same classrooms students with poorer achievement and social behavior records would be exposed to socialization experiences which would not challenge their previously inferior records and also keep them content.

Elsewhere we have reported in detail on the analysis of the effects of the record of student achievement and student behavior on teacher behavior (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979). The analysis suggested that these characteristics have more complex effects than we originally predicted. The response patterns differ in terms of the type of problem presented by the student (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980a). There is at least some evidence that teachers present more academic standards to students whose academic records

fall in the middle of the range of achievement. The results of the roll book student study show that students at either end of the achievement continuum seem to receive fewer standards. For behavior problems a distinctly different pattern emerges, for teachers present significantly more standards to students with records of good social behavior.

When teacher responses to academic and behavioral problems are coded in terms of warmth, two patterns emerge. First, teachers seem to be warmer to students with records of high achievement and to those with records of good behavior. Second, they use more explicit warmth with low achieving students and with poorly behaved students. While both trends appear in relation to student academic record and social behavior record, the relative strength of the trends differ. The result is that, overall, teachers are significantly warmer to students with records of low achievement than to those with records of high achievement, and that teachers are significantly warmer to students with records of good social behavior than to those with records of poor social behavior.

The failure to confirm our hypotheses regarding the relationship between teacher behavior and the performance characteristics led to re-examination of the data in an attempt to reconcile these findings at the classroom level with research on socialization differences between school tracks. Thus we decided to investigate the possibility that teachers behave differently toward students who can be easily classified (or are seen as more difficult to affect) than they do toward students who cannot be easily classified (or are seen as more susceptible to a teacher's influence). We suspected that students with congruent performance characteristics (high achievement and good social behavior, or low achievement and poor social behavior) were more easily classified than those with discrepant performance characteristics (high achievement and poor social behavior, or low achievement and good social behavior). Thus we predicted

that teachers would present more standards to students with discrepant performance characteristics because they perceived them as more susceptible to their influence. At the same time, we felt that teachers would be warmer to students with congruent performance characteristics because they were not so demanding of them. This hypothesis is consistent with findings at the school level, notably the findings of Cicourel and Kitsuse (1963) and Birman (1976) that counselors deal differently with students with discrepant characteristics than with those with congruent characteristics.

We tested the congruent/discrepant hypothesis at the classroom level using data from the hypothetical student study and comparing teacher responses for students with congruent performance characteristics to teacher responses for students with discrepant performance characteristics.** Our examination of differences in teacher responses to students with congruent and discrepant performance characteristics employed analyses at two levels. At the student level we examined the responses to the individual student profiles by forming contingency tables and calculating measures of association (gammas) for the relationships. At the teacher level we aggregated the data by teacher and performed matched-pairs t-tests to determine statistical significance.

In responding to academic problems teachers do seem to present different levels of standards to students with discrepant performance characteristics than they do to students with congruent performance characteristics. Students with discrepant performance characteristics evoked a greater proportion of explicit communications of standards (.25 for students with records of low achievement and good behavior; .26 for students with records of high achievement and poor behavior) than those students with congruent performance

**Similar congruent/discrepant comparisons were made using various combinations of performance and status characteristics and the status characteristics alone. These comparisons revealed no significant differences in teacher behavior.

characteristics (.17 for students with records of high achievement and good behavior; .19 for students with records of low achievement and poor behavior). This evidence provides some support for the congruent/discrepant argument.

In the area of behavior problems, however, the pattern of differences in teacher standards is not the same. Students with congruently high performance characteristics receive the lowest proportion of explicit communications of standards (.37) while students with congruently low performance characteristics receive the highest proportion of explicit communications of standards (.48). Students with records of discrepant performance characteristics evoke explicit communications of standards at a rate between those for the students with congruent performance characteristics (.42 for students with records of low achievement and good behavior; .46 for students with records of high achievement and poor behavior). Thus the congruent/discrepant argument seems to apply to academic problems but not to behavior problems.

These two findings are sustained in the analyses at the teacher level. The matched pairs t-test for the differences in teacher standards for students with congruent performance characteristics and teacher standards for students with discrepant performance characteristics reveals that, in responding to academic problems, teachers are significantly more likely to present standards to students with discrepant performance characteristics than to those with congruent performance characteristics. The means for teacher standards for academic problems are 2.41 for students with discrepant performance characteristics and 2.21 for students with congruent performance characteristics. With 155 teachers in the study, the difference is significant at the .01 level. As might be expected from the results of the analysis of individual responses to behavior problems, the analysis at the teacher level revealed no significant

differences in teacher standards for students with congruent and discrepant performance characteristics.

Thus two distinct patterns begin to emerge:

1) In responding to academic problems, teachers present more standards to students with discrepant performance characteristics than to those with congruent performance characteristics.

2) However, in responding to behavior problems, teachers present more standards to students with poor records of behavior than to those with good records of behavior. The congruence or discrepancy of the student's record of achievement with his record of behavior seems to either temper (if discrepant) or heighten (if congruent) the tendency associated with the performance record.

A different set of patterns is obtained when teacher responses are scored for warmth. In the area of academic problems students with congruent performance characteristics do receive higher proportions of communications of teacher warmth (.14 for students with records of high achievement and good behavior; .15 for students with records of low achievement and poor behavior) than students with discrepant performance characteristics (.13 for students with records of low achievement and good behavior; .09 for students with records of high achievement and poor behavior). The differences between the score for the low achievement/good behavior profile and those for the congruent profiles is too small to consider, but that between the score for the high achievement/poor behavior profile and those for the congruent profiles is more substantial and in the right direction.

In the area of behavior problems, however, the proportions of communications of teacher concern do not appear to be greater for students with congruent performance characteristics (.06 for students with records of high achievement and good behavior and for those with records of low achievement and poor behavior) than for those students with discrepant performance characteristics (.06 for students with records of low achievement and good behavior; .05 for students with records of high achievement and poor behavior).

At the teacher level, teacher responses to academic porblems are significantly warmer for students with congruent performance characteristics than for those with discrepant performance characteristics. The mean scores for teacher responses to academic problems are 1.33 for students with congruent performance characteristics and 1.02 for students with discrepant performance characteristics. With 155 teachers responding, this difference is significant at the .05 level. In the area of behavior problems the analysis at the teacher level reveals no significant differences in teacher warmth for students with congruent and discrepant performance characteristics.

Thus two patterns also emerge in regard to teacher warmth:

1) In responding to academic problems, teachers present more warmth to students with congruent performance characteristics than to those with discrepant performance characteristics.

2) In responding to behavior problems, teachers do not differ in the extent to which they present warmth to students with congruent performance characteristics and those with discrepant performance characteristics.

The argument that teachers will present more standards and less warmth to students with discrepant performance characteristics seems to hold only for teacher responses to academic problems. When teachers are dealing with behavior problems, their responses fall into a different pattern. In the area of behavior problems teachers are likely to present more standards and less warmth to students with records of poor behavior than they are to students with records of good behavior (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979).

Discussion

Two general findings are evident in our analyses of teacher responses. First, teachers differ in the patterns of their responses to academic and behavior problems presented by students. We have discussed this difference in response patterns at length elsewhere (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980a) and concluded that it is attributable to three structural characteristics of

the school and the teaching-learning situation: the relative visibility of the two teaching tasks (academic instruction vs. behavior control) both in the classroom and in the school; the relative conceptions of the student task held by the teacher (the active task of mastering academic content vs. the inert task of behaving suitably); and the relative degree to which supervisors possess expert power and its implications for exerting influence on teachers in regard to the two tasks (academic instruction vs. behavior control). Basically, this analysis suggests that these factors will result in differences in the organizational evaluation system across the hierarchy of administrator-teacher-student levels so that student behavior problems will be more tightly controlled in schools than academic problems. Since it is reasonable to conclude that student achievement and student behavior problems are linked, we feel that this feature of the school organization will have long term effects on students, leading to differences in socialization experiences. For example, the failure of schools to present standards for academic tasks may result in students with both academic and social behavior problems. Such students may then be subjected to very different socilization experiences, both in the classroom and between classrooms. Since this phenomenon may best be studied over time, we will restrict ourselves to the more direct effects of school and classroom structure on the stratification of socialization processes within the classroom.

Such direct effects are evident in the second type of pattern appearing in our present data. The distribution of academic standards appears to be related to teacher perceptions of their ability to affect students positively. This is sustained in our early analysis in which teachers presented more standards to students in the middle of the achievement range than to those at either extreme, as well as in our present analyses in which teachers

presented more standards to students with discrepant performance characteristics than to those with congruent performance characteristics. Students in the middle of the achievement range and those with discrepant performance characteristics may be seen by teachers as both in need of and able to benefit from the application of standards. Those at the high end of the achievement range and those with congruently high performance characteristics are seen as not needing the application of academic standards; and those at the low end of the achievement range and those with congruently low performance characteristics are seen as "lost souls" not able to benefit from the application of academic standards.

These patterns seem to be related to two structural features of the teaching-learning situation in the classroom in the school. One feature we have already discussed, namely the loose control of learning at both the school level and the classroom level. The second has to do with the batching of students in classes and the limited resources of teachers. If the presentation of academic standards is perceived as a limited resource in the sense that the teacher cannot present academic standards to all students at all times, then the distribution of those limited standards (resources) may hinge on the question of where they will do the most good -- at least if the teacher has the good intention of attempting to be as effective as possible. Thus it is possible to assume that well-intentioned teachers under structural conditions of limited instructional resources and loose control of learning tasks will allocate academic standards to students likely to need and benefit from them. Note that these differences in socialization experiences appear to be a good deal more complex and subtle than those posited by investigators of school effects (Bowles and Gintis, 1976). It is not simply a case of the best students getting the best socialization experiences. Note also that they appear to be connected to the structure of the school and the

classroom, rather than just an aspect of the link between the nature of society and the will of the teacher. Thus we might be more accurate to speak of structural bias instead of teacher bias.

We believe that the degree of control exercised through the evaluation system across the educational hierarchy is a structural feature of importance for the stratification of socialization processes. We get indirect support from our analysis of the teacher responses to behavior problems, problems related to teaching and learning tasks that are more tightly controlled by the school organization. For behavior problems our earlier analysis revealed that teachers presented more standards to those with poor social behavior records than to those with good social behavior records, and our later analysis showed that teachers presented the most standards to students with congruently low performance characteristics, followed by those with discrepant performance characteristics, and finally by those with congruently high performance characteristics. This suggests that the organization can influence the distribution of teacher standards under the high control condition. It also indicates if we consider teacher academic standards and teacher behavior standards as the same scarce resource, then the greater overall distribution of standards for behavior problems may result in a smaller overall distribution of standards for academic problems, a finding documented in detail elsewhere (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980a). Obviously, additional research is needed to more fully analyze this phenomenon.

So far we have not discussed the patterns of the distribution of teacher warmth. Indeed, these patterns where they do exist appear to mirror those of the distribution of teacher standards. For example, in responses to academic problems, students with discrepant performance characteristics receive both more standards and less warmth than do students with congruent performance characteristics. Overall, however, the patterns of the distribution of

teacher warmth do not seem closely related to the type of structural features which appear related to the distribution of standards. Our hunch is that the mirror images of the standards distributions that we found for warmth are the result of a widely shared belief that there is necessarily a negative relationship between standards and warmth (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980b) rather than the result of aspects of the internal structure of schools and classrooms. Moreover, we think it wise to follow Bidwell's lead (Bidwell, 1965) and attempt to relate teacher warmth to the conditions of organizational membership for students (Natriello, 1980). The present study is not an appropriate vehicle for examining the relationship of structural features to teacher warmth.

Conclusions

Our examination of the stratification of socialization processes within the classroom suggests that it is possible to begin to discuss both school effects and teacher effects as influenced by the structure of schools and classrooms. Research in these two rather different traditions should be useful to investigators in both areas. The key to linking these two bodies of research seems to lie in a new body of studies which identify specific teaching-learning tasks in the consideration of teacher and school effects. This specification of the tasks permits us to link teacher behavior variables to the structural aspects of the teaching-learning situation in classrooms and schools. In the present study we attempted to link teacher standards and warmth to internal aspects of the structure of the classroom and the school. While our use of standards in this case seemed to be fruitful for linking teacher behavior to structural aspects of the classroom and the school, at least for the teaching-learning tasks as we specified them, the use of teacher warmth appears not to be related to these internal aspects, but rather to the conditions of student membership in the school organization. While further

work is needed both on the identification of teacher behavior variables and school and classroom structure variables, the present approach seems to represent an improvement over the strategy of the school effects researchers who have ignored teacher behavior variables and that of the teacher effects researchers who have ignored the structure of schools.

References

Alexander, Karl, Martha Cook, and Edward L. McDill. 1978. "Curriculum Tracking and Educational Stratification." American Sociological Review 43:47-66.

Alexander, Karl and Edward L. McDill. 1976. "Selection and Allocation Within Schools: Some Causes and Consequences of Curriculum Placement." American Sociological Review 41:963-980.

Bidwell, Charles E. 1965. "The School as a Formal Organization." Pp. 972-1022 in J. G. March, ed., The Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Birman, B. 1976. Discrepant Student Characteristics and Counseling: A Study of Counselor Interaction, Warmth, and Influence. Stanford, California: Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Carnoy, Martin and Henry M. Levin. 1976. The Limits of Educational Reform. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Cicourel, A.V. and J.I. Kitsuse. 1965. The Educational Decision-Makers. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Collins, Randall. 1971. "Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification." American Sociological Review 36:1002-1009.

Coons, John E., William H. Clune III, and Stephen D. Sugarman. 1970. Private Wealth and Public Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Dreeben, Robert. 1968. On What is Learned in School. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Dusek, Jerome B. 1975. "Do Teachers Bias Children's Learning?" Review of Educational Research 45:661-684.

Feldman, K.A. and T. H. Newcomb. 1969. The Impact of Colleges on Students. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.

Heyns, Barbara. 1974. "Social Selection and Stratification Within Schools." American Journal of Sociology 79:1434-1451.

Jencks, Christopher, et al. 1972. Inequality. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Meyer, John. 1977. "The Effects of Education as an Institution." American Journal of Sociology 83:55-77.

Natriello, Gary and Sanford M. Dornbusch. 1980a. Academic Instruction or Behavioral Control: An Experimental Study of Teacher Responses to Classroom Problems. Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Boston, Massachusetts.

Natriello, Gary and Sanford M. Dornbusch. 1979. Bringing Behavior Back In: The Effects of Student Characteristics and Behavior on the Classroom Behavior of Teachers. Unpublished Paper, St. Louis, Missouri.

Natriello, Gary. 1980. Organizational Membership. Paper prepared for the Institute Seminar Series. St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University Graduate Institute of Education.

Natriello, Gary and Sanford M. Dornbusch. 1980b. Providing Direction and Building Commitment: A Study of Teacher Standards and Warmth. Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Boston, Massachusetts.

Natriello, Gary. 1979. Teacher Standards and Teacher Warmth in the Classroom: Toward a Theory of Teaching as Institutional Leadership. Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Northwest Research and Evaluation Conference. Seattle, Washington.

Rist, R. 1970. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review 40:411-451.

Rosenbaum, J.S. 1975. "The Stratification of Socialization Processes." American Sociological Review 35:1014-1027.

Rosenshine, Barak. 1976. "Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement." Journal of Teacher Education 27:61-64.

Rosenshine, Barak and Norma Furst. 1973. "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching." Pp. 122-183 in M.W. Travers ed., Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.